

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1-11 are pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner specifically alleges that the steps “receiving a permission request” and “responding affirmatively” of claim 1 are not supported by the disclosure. Applicants respectfully disagree, and submit that these steps are clearly supported by, for example, at least the last paragraph on page 21 of the disclosure, which states in part:

Subsequently, the MD player 200 thus recognized to have been connected executes an arbitration to the controller 32 for requesting a permission to transfer the voice recognition table ITm to a voice recognition unit 31. Upon permission of such transfer by the cotroller [sic] 32 in response to the arbitration, the MD player 200 transfers the self voice recognition table ITm to the voice recognition unit 31. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, the steps of “receiving a permission request” and “responding affirmatively” of claim 1, and similar recitations of claim 7, are supported by the disclosure.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and allow the application. Moreover, Applicants request the Examiner to call the undersigned to resolve any outstanding issues before issuing another Office Action, in order to expedite prosecution.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 12, 2010

By: 
Fahd Hussein Patel
Reg. No. 61,780
(202) 408-6072